# What Should We Build Upon the Wreckage?

*Servideus Yava. 30/05/2026*

If authenticity is not a state but a process, and if every system remains vulnerable to the unintended consequences of its own operations, then the question after deconstruction is not whether we should abolish systems altogether; because we cannot, as it would left us in fragmentation that alienate our capability to let other correct us through perturbation of environment to our systems.

Nor can we hope to construct a perfect system that permanently reconciles intention and outcome. Since every institution, every identity, every philosophy eventually encounters the same problem: what it produces exceeds what it intended. The consequences of a system are never entirely visible from within the logic that generated them. A gap emerges between what a system aims to do and what it actually does.

The lesson then, is not that systems are impossible to be avoided nor redeemed, but that systems are revisable through design.

What should emerge from the wreckage, then, is neither reconstruction in the traditional sense nor perpetual deconstruction. It is the institutionalization of reconstruction itself.

A system should not be designed around the assumption that it is correct. It should be designed around the assumption that it will eventually encounter the limits of its own understanding.

The question is no longer whether a system is true, but whether it remains capable of learning.

This requires a shift in how we think about failure. Failure is not merely an obstacle to be eliminated. It is information. Contradictions between intentions and consequences reveal aspects of reality that the system was unable to account for. What appears as noise from one perspective may become a source of adaptation from another.

A healthy institution therefore does not respond to contradiction through repression, nor to complexity through dissolution. It responds through revision.

As institutions act upon the world, they generate results. Those results, in turn, provide feedback about the adequacy of the institution itself. The task is to preserve and strengthen this feedback loop. The purpose is not to guarantee correctness, but to maintain the possibility of correction.

In this sense, learning becomes a political principle.

Not because learning leads to final truth, but because every attempt to close the process prematurely risks destroying the very conditions under which improvement becomes possible. Dogma, whether political, philosophical, or personal, becomes dangerous when it suppresses the signals that might reveal its own limitations.

What matters, then, is not the permanence of a structure but its capacity for self-revision.

The institutions we build should not seek immunity from criticism. They should seek responsiveness to it. They should preserve channels through which their consequences can be observed, questioned, and transformed. They should remain open to the possibility that what they exclude today may become necessary tomorrow. A genuinely revisable system must then, have second-order feedback—mechanisms that can question the criteria for success itself, not just performance within fixed criteria. Otherwise, “learning” becomes a sophisticated form of stagnation, or worse, better oppression.

Since learning for learning sake can produce a horrendous possibility of efficient oppressor, We should then agree on what should be the purpose of system itself? Personally speaking, for me, what distinguishes better learning from worse learning, is an unfinished but orienting ideal of human flourishing. Lesser human dying and actually living, for the lack of better word, should be the goal of learning itself, as it would brings us closer to near-authentic live that is closer to emancipation than repression.

That has a lot of undefined parameters, and would also left a lot of readers to have contradiction between different interpretations, or that whole framing themselves are maybe rejected. So what should be the virtue if it cannot be approached positively and then taken as given, as it would make the whole learning project themselves frozen?

Then the next focus couldn’t be about our own parameters, but the error themselves. Can we approach a better design through apophatic process? Then the question are replaced from ‘what

is' into 'what is it not'. Then notice that for every attempt at building a structure would leave a residue of what it is repressed to function. The error becomes a possibility of a better structure in which, the repressed are accounted for and thus the system are redesign for it to have a better affirmative sphere than the current structure.

So the mission become that: Build institutions that act like their own permanence as a crime, and their own revisability as a virtue—then anchor revisability not in efficiency, but in the negative test of whether those who suffer can speak without being silenced.

Those formulation in itself, is incomplete; so it then requires further collaboration of thought through criticism. Personally speaking, so that the project of creating a learning subject can be 'truly' emancipatory than it is performative; even if ironically the 'true learning' itself is deferred. For lack of better criterion, the proposal that incurred is: a system is 'better' when: 1) It has corrigible structure that allows for its evolution. 2) It affirms the potential of the subjects while negate its destructive capabilities that can negate the potential of others. 3) Its own structure are ephemeral when it claims for finality in the face of its demand of corrigibility itself; in the sense that, permanence of structure must be deeply scrutinized if it contradicts its corrigibility and are producing a growing contradiction. 4) Synergy of the system, its constituents, and the environment is the asymptotic line of the system themselves.

Loosely then, we can take a proposition that a system is improving if, over time, fewer forms of suffering require explicit articulation to be recognized, as it is being acted upon early on by the system; and more forms of suffering generate revision without organized violence, either from the environment or the system itself.

The goal then, is less about a perfect society, and more about a society capable of learning from its imperfections.

If modernity dreamed of final foundations, and postmodernity taught us why those foundations crack, then the task that follows is neither absolute certainty nor fragmentative skepticism.

It is reconstruction without finality. Not constructivism, but indefinite reconstructivism. To keep building with a certainty that it would be corrected and are falsified, before another structure are build upon once more.

A commitment to building systems that can recognize their own failures, revise their own assumptions, and evolve alongside the worlds they inhabit.

Then what should we build upon the wreckage? For me, it is not a monuments that repress nor ruins that left us with a wreckage. It is an institutions and society that capable of becoming. To what ends? Provisionally, into the world of less-suffering, and when our criterion contradict itself, we would re-learn from it and maybe, for one more time indefinitely, rebuild.

## A Kinstugi

There's a philosophy from Japan: Kintsugi. When a plate shatters or clipped, they would be reassembled with a new, gold-like glue so that the previously broken glass, would then become a better, more valuable glass rather than before its fraction. A crack, is a chance for a structure to evolve, and must be appreciated for the space of development it had provided and not for itself. Any cracks in the system therefore, at every iteration of its development, must cite what problem it tries to resolve beforehand, so that the value behind a structure remains visible. Let us see how our failures become golden cracks in our structure of governance, and let it broke again, so that we can rebuild it more beautiful; and with all the irony, let it then be destroyed again, so that another, better structure born anew, and so on.

But when will we actually know when to stop? I assume that, we will never. For as long as there's an incompleteness somewhere, even on the very identity of a human, the 'I' that excluding its own irritant of the self, there'll always be a problem to work upon. Because when existence itself is an exclusion of something which is not, incompleteness would forever exist and corrigibility would remain a core principle, as alienation itself is unavoidable in every form.

The question then becomes, what is our quest then, if it never end?

My answer then, is that our journey is not to strive towards perfection, but strive through the contradiction itself, indefinitely. Even if Zizek may question 'what if Progress itself is an illusion?', I would answer that: even if we know; and precisely because we know it is an illusion; that impossibility of reconciliation and progress is very much existent, I would like to move on regardless. There's a way, a better alternative, and static would be betrayal.

A half-assed enjoyment in irony in which postmodernists had left some of us paralyzed in their worldview must then be acted upon sincerely: not only we enjoy irony through finding of gaps, but are willing to be betrayed by reality itself, making our belief really tested against so that we know what we lacked and how do we move.

At least, by being honest about our ‘illusion’, we can strive towards something, even when we don’t know what it is; because its alternatives are a static tyrant. Because yes, it may be an illusion; but as long as we cannot get out from these illusions, we are nonetheless bound by it; as these illusion themselves that trapped us into an antagonism of our subject with the reality that still falsify us.

The question then: what would you do with this illusion? Would you stand still on it? or move on regardless? Trying to lessen that antagonism towards maybe, better tomorrow?

Will this project be another ‘Utopia’ that is imposed and produces tyrant? I don’t know, but I know I want a book that can be rewritten indefinitely, according to our ‘needs’, whatever that may be. Because we move not because there is something that we had grasp in our hand, but because there is something else that may exist; the very impossibility and wants, and to dance with that impossibility of ideal in the face of chaotic world, and to stumble across the ballroom. But I think this is the very grace upon ourselves: that there’ll always be available space for us to explore, and that exploration would never be enough.

I make this entire theory on the basis of repression that i might be wrong, or that this movement itself is already compromised. I necessarily need to repress this in order to be wrong productively rather than paralytically.

Even if this whole theory is wrong, and there is an universal that is complete or variables that I'm excluding of but cannot account for, that can be accessed by us, whether that is communism, or ultimate caliphate, or other utopia; or even that non-system or freedom can be achieved with immediacy and pure becoming like some anarchist demand; the approach of truth and coherence via what it is not, would produces far more progress rather than outright universal that is imposed and debated while focusing on the false emphasis of what is the best approach or goals.

That is because we are far from the utopia itself, and thus, learning from error is a better approach toward it rather than fixative illusion of completeness.

If one truly believes in an absoluteness of ideal that can be achieved, then betrayal is static instead of movement. So wrongness, isn't particularly bad; it is how we react to being wrong and move on, rather than continuously wrong.

In here, perhaps, in the face of asymptotic journey, Sisyphus would never have his rock tumbling down, as there’ll no tip to catch upon. He will become better each day, ascending, transcending his past continuously. Perhaps, and I hope, that through this, we will able to experience infinity itself, through infinite struggle and happiness. Because as much as I want to avoid Utopia, it is regardless a nice dream to have while we suffer; and I want to at least make this suffering means something that is impossible.